



Remarks

This communication is in response to the Examiner's Official Action dated 27 October 1999. Applicants note the Examiner's comments on the Restriction Action. Applicants disagree with the Examiner's conclusions.

The Examiner has rejected claims 11–18 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, paragraph 2. The Examiner asserts that proper antecedent basis is lacking for "the housing," "the spray nozzle," "the hot humid atmosphere," and "the inlet." Applicants assert that support for the term "the housing" appears in the claim as filed in the specification at page 11, line 15 after "extraction means comprising a." Applicants assert that support for the term "the inlet" appears in the claim as filed in the specification at page 11, line 13 after "at least one."

Applicants assert that the amended claim resolve all other informalities and the Examiner's rejection is now moot. Support for the amendment is found on page 2, line 7 to page 4, line 15 and in the claims as filed. No new matter is entered by way of amendment. The purpose of the amendment is to remedy formal matters, is not meant to affect scope of the claims and is not done in response to an action based on prior art.

Respectfully submitted,

30 Nov 99
Date


Mark DiPietro
Reg. No. 28,707
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
3100 Norwest Center
Minneapolis, MN 55402-4131
Telephone: (612) 371-5375
E-mail: mdipietro@merchant-gould.com